UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

DEVON TERRELL ABNEY,

D 1	•	. •	CC
וט	2111	tı	++
11	ain	u	TT,

Case No. 23-10082-DT

v.

HON. DENISE PAGE HOOD

CITY OF DETROIT, DONALD R. PARKER, NICOLE J. SUMPTER, and JOHN DOE,

D	erendar	IIS.		
				1

ORDER DENYING MOTION ALTERING OR AMENDING JUDGMENT (ECF No. 14) AND MOTION FOR MASTER APPOINTMENT (ECF No. 15)

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Devon Terrell Abney's Motion for Altering or Amendment Judgment and Motion for Master Appointment citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e), E.D. Mich. LR 59.1. (ECF Nos. 14, 15) On March 16, 2023, the Court entered an Order Summarily Dismissing and Closing Action and Judgment. (ECF Nos. 6, 7) The Court thereafter entered Orders Denying Motion for Relief from Judgment, Denying Motion for Reconsideration, and Denying Motion for Vindication of Plaintiff's Civil Rights. (ECF Nos. 9, 11, 13)

The Local Rules of the Eastern District of Michigan provide that a motion to reconsider an order denying a motion for reconsideration may not be filed. E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(h)(4). As noted above, the Court has entered at least three orders

denying Plaintiff's post-judgment motions to reconsider and/or for relief from the

judgment entered by the Court. The Court therefore denies Plaintiff's current and

fourth motion seeking relief from the Court's judgment.

Even if the Court were to consider Abney's current motion, he has not shown

he is entitled to any relief from the judgment entered by the Court. As this Court

found in its March 28, 2024 Order, Abney failed to meet the "unusual and extreme

situations where principles of equity mandate relief" standard for relief under Rule

60(b)(6). (ECF No. 9, PageID.89) Abney's claims were dismissed based on the

applicable three-year statute of limitations under Michigan law. (*Id.* at PageID.90)

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion Altering or Amending Judgment

(ECF No. 14) is once again DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Master Appointment

(ECF No. 15) is DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any Appeal of this Order would be frivolous

and would not be taken in good faith. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3); Coppedge v. United

2

States, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962).

s/Denise Page Hood

DENISE PAGE HOOD

United States District Judge

DATED: March 31, 2025